United Nations

FCCC/IRR/2017/MCO

Framework Convention on Climate Change

Distr.: General
23 March 2018

English only

Report on the review of the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol of Monaco

Note by the expert review team

Summary

According to decision 2/CMP.8, each Party with a quantified emission limitation and reduction commitment inscribed in the third column of Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol, as contained in annex I to decision 1/CMP.8, shall submit to the secretariat a report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. In accordance with decision 22/CMP.1, annex I, paragraph 11, in conjunction with decision 4/CMP.11, the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount is subject to a review. This report presents the results of the technical review of the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, conducted by an expert review team in accordance with the "Guidelines for review under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol". The review took place from 25 to 30 September 2017 in Bonn, Germany.

GE.18-04537(E)

1804537

Please recycle

Contents

		Paragraphs	*Page*
I.	Introduction	1–2	3
II.	Summary of the reporting on mandatory elements in the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount	3	4
III.	Technical assessment of the elements reviewed	4	5
IV.	Questions of implementation	5	7
Annexes			
I.	Key relevant data for Monaco		8
II.	Documents and information used during the review		12
III.	Acronyms and abbreviations		13

I. Introduction[1]

1. The review of the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol (hereinafter referred to as the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount) of Monaco was organized by the UNFCCC secretariat, in accordance with the "Guidelines for review under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol".[2] The review took place from 25 to 30 September 2017 in Bonn, Germany, and was coordinated by Ms. Lisa Hanle, Ms. Alma Jean and Mr. Simon Wear (UNFCCC secretariat). Table 1 provides information on the composition of the expert review team (ERT) that conducted the review of Monaco.

2. A draft version of this report was communicated to the Government of Monaco, which provided no comments.

Table 1
Composition of the expert review team that conducted the review of Monaco

Area of expertise	*Name*	*Party*
Generalist	Ms. Mausami Desai	United States of America
	Ms. Jolanta Merkelienė	Lithuania
Energy	Mr. Naofumi Kosaka	Japan
	Ms. Brooke Perkins	Australia
	Mr. Michael Smith	New Zealand
IPPU	Mr. Kendal Blanco-Salas	Costa Rica
	Ms. Ils Moorkens	Belgium
	Mr. Ioannis Sempos	Greece
Agriculture	Ms. Marta Alfaro	Chile
	Ms. Fatou Gaye	Gambia
	Ms. Alice Ryan	New Zealand
LULUCF	Ms. Esther Mertens	Belgium
	Mr. Koki Okawa	Japan
	Mr. Igor Onopchuk	Ukraine
	Mr. Iordanis Tzamtzis	Greece
Waste	Mr. Mark Hunstone	Australia
	Mr. Gabor Kis-Kovacs	Hungary
	Mr. Phindile Mangwana	South Africa
Lead reviewers	Ms. Alfaro	
	Mr. Hunstone	

Abbreviations: IPPU = industrial processes and product use, LULUCF = land use, land-use change and forestry.

[1] At the time of publication of this report, Monaco had submitted its instrument of ratification of the Doha Amendment; however, the amendment had not yet entered into force. The implementation of the provisions of the Doha Amendment is therefore considered in this report in the context of decision 1/CMP.8, paragraph 6, pending the entry into force of the amendment.

[2] Decision 22/CMP.1 and its annex and any revisions contained in decision 4/CMP.11 and its annex I.

II. Summary of the reporting on mandatory elements in the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount

3. Table 2 provides a summary of the ERT's assessment of the reporting of mandatory elements by Monaco in its report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount. Key data and elections by the Party are included in table 4.

Table 2
Expert review team's assessment of the reporting of mandatory elements by Monaco in its report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount

Item		*Comment*
General Party information		
Date of submission	[redacted]	Original submission: 4 August 2017
Are there any missing categories or issues related to completeness[a] in the reporting of GHG emissions by sources and removals by sinks for the base year or period?	Yes	For further information, see document FCCC/ARR/2017/MCO, ID#s I.11 and I.12 in table 5
Was the GHG inventory recalculated in accordance with decision 4/CMP.7 for all years from 1990 to the most recent year available?	Yes	
Did the Party report the base year for NF_3?	Yes	See annex I, table 4
Information related to the assigned amount and the commitment period reserve		
Was the assigned amount in the original submission calculated in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 8, of the Kyoto Protocol, Article 3, paragraphs 7 bis and 8 bis, as contained in the Doha Amendment, and decision 13/CMP.1 in conjunction with decision 3/CMP.11?	No	See annex I, table 4. For further information, see ID# 1 in table 3
Has the Party reported in the original submission the difference between the assigned amount for the second commitment period and average annual emissions for the first three years of the first commitment period, multiplied by eight?	Yes	See annex I, table 4. For further information, see ID# 7 in table 3
Has the Party indicated in the original submission the approach[b] used to calculate average annual emissions for the first three years of the first commitment period?	No	See annex I, table 4. For further information, see ID# 8 in table 3
Did land-use change and forestry constitute a net source of GHG emissions in the base year, and therefore did the Party include emissions from deforestation in the calculation of the assigned amount?	Yes	For further information, see ID# 1 in table 3
Was the commitment period reserve in the original submission calculated in accordance with the annex to decision 18/CP.7, the annex to decision 11/CMP.1, the annex to decision 13/CMP.1, paragraph 8 quinquies, and decision 1/CMP.8, paragraph 18?	No	See annex I, table 4. For further information, see ID# 2 in table 3
Information related to activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol		
If the Party identified activities elected under Article 3, paragraph 4, of the Kyoto Protocol, are these elections in accordance with decision 2/CMP.7, annex, paragraphs 6–8?	NA	See annex I, table 4
Do the activities elected under Article 3, paragraph 4, of the Kyoto Protocol for the second commitment period include at least those activities elected for the first commitment period?	Yes	

Item		*Comment*
Is information reported on how the national system under Article 5, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol will identify land areas associated with all additional elected activities and how the Party ensures that land that was accounted for in the first commitment period continues to be accounted for in the second commitment period?	No	For further information, see ID# 6 in table 3
Has the Party identified for each activity under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol whether it intends to account annually or for the entire commitment period?	Yes	See annex I, table 4. For further information, see ID# 3 in table 3
Did the Party provide information on the forest management reference level, including, if appropriate, information on technical corrections and information on how emissions from harvested wood products originating from forests prior to the start of the second commitment period have been calculated in the reference level?	Yes	See annex I, table 4. For further information, see ID# 4 in table 3
Has the Party reported the quantity amounting to 3.5% of the base year GHG emissions, excluding LULUCF, in the original submission?	No	See annex I, table 4. For further information, see ID# 5 in table 3
Did the Party indicate whether it intends to apply the provisions to exclude emissions from natural disturbances for the accounting for afforestation and reforestation and/or forest management and provide the relevant information in accordance with decision 2/CMP.7, annex, paragraph 33?	Yes	See annex I, table 4
Information related to the national system and national registry		
Was a description of the national system provided, in accordance with the guidelines for national systems under Article 5, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol?	NA	This information was already reported and reviewed as part of the initial review of the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount for the first commitment period and did not need to be reported
Was a description of the national registry provided, in accordance with the requirements contained in the annex to decision 13/CMP.1, the annex to decision 5/CMP.1 and the technical standards for data exchange between registry systems adopted by the CMP?	NA	This information was already reported and reviewed as part of the initial review of the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount for the first commitment period and did not need to be reported

Abbreviations: CMP = Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, GHG = greenhouse gas, LULUCF = land use, land-use change and forestry, NA = not applicable.

[a] Issues related to missing categories and completeness are only for those categories for which methods are available in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*.

[b] Parties may elect to calculate average annual emissions for the first three years of the first commitment period by including either the gases and sources listed in Annex A to the Kyoto Protocol, or the GHGs, sectors and source categories used to calculate the assigned amount for the second commitment period.

III. Technical assessment of the elements reviewed

4. The review of the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol for Monaco has been undertaken together with the review of the 2017 annual submission, and in accordance with decision 22/CMP.1

in conjunction with decision 4/CMP.11.[3] Table 3 contains additional information, if any, to support the ERT's assessment included in table 2 above of the Party's capacity to account for its emissions and the assigned amount, specifically related to: the calculation of the assigned amount for the second commitment period and any adjustments applied; information related to Article 3, paragraph 7 ter, as contained in the Doha Amendment; information related to reporting of activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol; calculation of the commitment period reserve; and the national system and national registry.

Table 3
Additional findings of the expert review team, if any, related to Monaco's reporting of mandatory elements in its report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount

ID#	*Finding classification*	*Description of the finding*	*Classification of problem*
1.	Calculation of the assigned amount	The assigned amount submitted by the Party in its report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount was not calculated in accordance with Article 3, paragraphs 7 bis, 8 and 8 bis, of the Kyoto Protocol, the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 and annex I to decision 3/CMP.11 The Party reported its assigned amount as 619 707 t CO_2 eq. However, during the review, the ERT identified that there was a calculation error that had led to the incorrect calculation of the assigned amount. In determining the base year, the Party used 1990 values for HFC, PFC and SF_6 emissions rather than 1995 values, the base year selected for these gases in the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. The ERT informed Monaco that it must apply the same base year of 1995 for these gases in the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. Instead of base-year emissions of 99 312 t CO_2 eq, as originally reported by Monaco, the ERT calculated the Party's base-year emissions to be 99 319 t CO_2 eq LULUCF is a net source of GHG emissions in 1990 for Monaco (0.0016 kt CO_2 eq). Therefore, in accordance with decision 13/CMP.1 in conjunction with decision 3/CMP.11, total base-year emissions for the purpose of the calculation of the assigned amount under the Kyoto Protocol shall also include GHG emissions from conversion of forests (deforestation). Because Monaco reports in its annual submission that conversion of forests (deforestation) does not occur in the country (reported LULUCF emissions are due to fertilizer use and conversion of green zone areas to settlement areas only), the ERT concludes that there are no emissions from deforestation to add to the base year Taking into account the revised base-year estimate of 99 319 t CO_2 eq, the ERT recalculated the assigned amount and determined it to be 619 751 t CO_2 eq. The Party agreed with this estimate	Not a problem
2.	Calculation of the commitment period reserve	The CPR was not calculated in accordance with the annex to decision 18/CP.7, the annex to decision 11/CMP.1 and decision 1/CMP.8, paragraph 18 The Party reported its CPR as 557 736 t CO_2 eq. However, during the review, the ERT identified that the CPR was calculated incorrectly. The CPR depends on the calculation of the assigned amount, which relies in turn on the determination of the base-year CO_2 eq emissions (see ID# 1 above). Use of the correct base-year CO_2 eq emission estimates results in a revised assigned amount of 619 751 t CO_2 and a CPR of 557 777 t CO_2 eq. The Party agreed with this revised value	Not a problem
3.	Accounting of activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol	The ERT found that Monaco's communication of its intent regarding the periodicity of accounting under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol was not clear in the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount. During the review, the Party confirmed that it intends to account for activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, over the entire commitment period	Not a problem

[3] The annual review report on the 2017 inventory submission of Monaco is available at <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2017/arr/mco.pdf>.

ID#	*Finding classification*	*Description of the finding*	*Classification of problem*
4.	Accounting of activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol	In its report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount, Monaco indicated that it considers that it is not subject to the reporting obligations under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol. The ERT notes that Monaco does not have an FMRL inscribed in the annex to decision 2/CMP.7, where it is noted that Monaco did not submit an FRML owing to its lack of forest land. Monaco's reporting of no FMRL was accepted in the report of the technical assessment of the FMRL of Monaco submitted in 2011 (FCCC/TAR/2011/MCO, para. 5). The ERT agrees that Monaco has sufficiently met the reporting requirement in decision 2/CMP.8, annex I, paragraph 1(i)	Not a problem
5.	Accounting of activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol	Monaco did not provide a forest management cap in its report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount. The ERT noted that Monaco does not have an FMRL reported in the annex to decision 2/CMP.7, which contains a footnote indicating that Monaco did not propose an FMRL owing to its lack of forest land. Nevertheless, the ERT finds that Monaco could calculate a forest management cap, calculated as 3.5% of the base-year estimates, and report this value in the accounting tables. During the review, the ERT calculated the forest management cap to be 3.476 kt CO_2 eq (27.809 kt CO_2 eq for the duration of the commitment period). Monaco agreed with this value	Not a problem
6.	Accounting of activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol	The Party reported in its 2017 national inventory report and in its report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount that no forest land occurs in Monaco. However, the Party has not demonstrated that it monitors land use and change over time, in particular by conducting a survey to determine whether green zones remain below the thresholds set by the forest definition (see document FCCC/ARR/2017/MCO, ID#s L.10 and KL.2 in table 5)	Accuracy
7.	Reporting pursuant to Article 3.7 ter of the Doha Amendment	The ERT noted that the Party provided information in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 7 ter, of the Doha Amendment; specifically, the Party reported the difference between the assigned amount for the second commitment period and the average annual emissions for the first three years of the preceding commitment period, multiplied by eight. The Party calculated this difference to be –92 057 t CO_2 eq. However, during the review, the ERT identified a calculation error in the assigned amount (see ID# 1 above) that led to the incorrect calculation of the difference. Owing to the calculation error, the ERT recalculated the difference between the average annual emissions for the first three years of the previous commitment period and the assigned amount to be –92 460 t CO_2 eq. The Party agreed with this value	Not a problem
8.	Reporting pursuant to Article 3.7 ter of the Doha Amendment	Monaco did not report in its original submission the approach used to calculate average annual emissions for the first three years of the first commitment period. During the review, Monaco clarified that it used the gases and sources listed in Annex A to the Kyoto Protocol. The ERT agreed with Monaco's approach	Not a problem
9.	Adjustments	The ERT has not identified the need to apply any adjustments to the estimate for the assigned amount for the second commitment period, as reported by Monaco in its report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount	Not a problem

Abbreviations: CPR = commitment period reserve, ERT = expert review team, FMRL = forest management reference level, GHG = greenhouse gas, LULUCF = land use, land-use change and forestry.

IV. Questions of implementation

5. No questions of implementation were identified by the ERT during the review related to the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount. With respect to the question of implementation related to Monaco's 2017 annual submission, see document FCCC/ARR/2017/MCO, table 6.

Annex I

Key relevant data for Monaco

1. Table 4 provides key data and parameters for, and elections by, Monaco, relevant for the implementation of the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. The information included in table 4 is as given by the Party in its report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount, unless otherwise specified.

Table 4
Key relevant data for Monaco

Key information or parameter provided	*Comment*
General Party information	
Did the Party have a QELRC in the first commitment period?	Yes
Monaco's QELRC in the second commitment period	78% of the base year
Has the Party reached an agreement under Article 4 of the Kyoto Protocol to fulfil its commitments jointly with other Parties?	No
Base year	1990
Base year for HFCs, PFCs and SF_6	1995
Base year for NF_3	1990
Base-year emissions, as reported by the Party	99 312 t CO_2 eq, including GHG emissions from conversion of forests (deforestation) (see ID# 1 in table 3)
Base-year emissions, final, as calculated by the ERT and agreed by the Party	99 319 t CO_2 eq (see ID# 1 in table 3)
Information related to the calculation of the assigned amount and the commitment period reserve	
Assigned amount, as reported by the Party	619 707 t CO_2 eq, including GHG emissions from conversion of forests (deforestation) (see ID# 1 in table 3)
Assigned amount, final, as calculated by the ERT	619 751 t CO_2 eq (see ID# 1 in table 3)
Approach used to calculate the average annual emissions for the first three years of the first commitment period	The gases and sources listed in Annex A to the Kyoto Protocol
Difference between the assigned amount for the second commitment period and average annual emissions for the first three years of the first commitment period, multiplied by eight, as reported by the Party	–92 057 t CO_2 eq
Difference between the assigned amount for the second commitment period and average annual emissions for the first three years of the first commitment period, multiplied by eight, final value, as calculated by the ERT and agreed by the	–92 460 t CO_2 eq (see ID# 7 in table 3)

Key information or parameter provided	*Comment*
Party	
Commitment period reserve, as reported by the Party	557 736 t CO_2 eq
Commitment period reserve, final value, as calculated by the ERT	557 777 t CO_2 eq (see ID# 2 in table 3)
Information related to activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol	
LULUCF parameters	Minimum tree crown cover: 10% Minimum land area: 0.5 ha Minimum tree height: 5 m
Elections under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol:	
(a) Afforestation/reforestation	Commitment period accounting
(b) Deforestation	Commitment period accounting
(c) Forest management	Commitment period accounting
(d) Cropland management	Not elected
(e) Grazing land management	Not elected
(f) Revegetation	Not elected
(g) Wetland drainage and rewetting	Not elected
FMRL	The appendix to decision 2/CMP.7 does not contain an FMRL for Monaco (Monaco did not propose an FMRL owing to its lack of forest land) (see ID# 4 in table 3)
Technical corrections to the FMRL as reported in the original submission and agreed by the ERT	Not reported in the original submission as Monaco does not have an FMRL (see ID# 4 in table 3)
3.5% of total base-year GHG emissions, excluding LULUCF, as reported by the Party	Not reported in the original submission
3.5% of total base-year GHG emissions, excluding LULUCF, final value, as calculated by the ERT	3 476 kt CO_2 eq (see ID# 5 in table 3)
3.5% of total base-year GHG emissions, excluding LULUCF, multiplied by eight, as reported by the Party in the original submission	Not reported in the original submission
3.5% of total base-year GHG emissions, excluding LULUCF, multiplied by eight, final value, as calculated by the ERT	27 809 kt CO_2 eq (see ID# 5 in table 3)
Will the Party exclude emissions from natural disturbances in accounting for:	
(a) Afforestation and reforestation	No
(b) Forest management	No

Abbreviations: ERT = expert review team, FMRL = forest management reference level, GHG = greenhouse gas, LULUCF = land use, land-use change and forestry, QELRC = quantified emission limitation and reduction commitment.

2. Tables 5–7 provide an overview of total greenhouse gas emissions and removals, as submitted by Monaco. Where a Party has decided to voluntarily report indirect carbon dioxide emissions, this is noted in the relevant table.

Table 5
Total greenhouse gas emissions for Monaco, base year[a]–2015[b]
(kt CO_2 eq)

Year	*Total GHG emissions excluding indirect CO_2 emissions*		*Total GHG emissions including indirect CO_2 emissions[c]*		*Land-use change (Article 3.7 bis as contained in the Doha Amendment)[d]*
	Total including LULUCF	*Total excluding LULUCF*	*Total including LULUCF*	*Total excluding LULUCF*	
Base year	99.32	99.32	NA	NA	NO
1990	99.31	99.31	NA	NA	
1995	103.51	103.53	NA	NA	
2000	107.80	107.84	NA	NA	
2010	86.68	86.73	NA	NA	
2011	83.10	83.14	NA	NA	
2012	87.03	87.06	NA	NA	
2013	87.43	87.46	NA	NA	
2014	79.78	79.81	NA	NA	
2015	81.78	81.71	NA	NA	

Abbreviations: GHG = greenhouse gas, LULUCF = land use, land-use change and forestry, NA = not applicable, NO = not occurring.

[a] Base year refers to the base year under the Kyoto Protocol, which is 1990 for CO_2, CH_4, N_2O and NF_3, and 1995 for HFCs, PFCs and SF_6.

[b] Emissions/removals reported in the sector other (sector 6) are not included in total GHG emissions.

[c] The Party has not reported indirect CO_2 emissions in common reporting format table 6.

[d] The value reported in this column refers to 1990. Although LULUCF was a source of emissions in 1990, Monaco reports in its annual submission that conversion of forests (deforestation) does not occur in the country and there are no emissions from deforestation to add to the base year.

Table 6
Greenhouse gas emissions by gas for Monaco, excluding land use, land-use change and forestry, 1990–2015[a]
(kt CO_2 eq)

Year	*CO_2[b]*	*CH_4*	*N_2O*	*HFCs*	*PFCs*	*Unspecified mix of HFCs and PFCs*	*SF_6*	*NF_3*
1990	95.30	2.13	1.65	0.02	NO, IE	NO	0.22	NO
1995	98.99	1.61	2.69	0.12	NO, IE	NO	0.12	NO
2000	98.32	2.45	3.48	3.47	NO, IE	NO	0.12	NO
2010	75.46	2.55	4.33	4.28	NO, IE	NO	0.11	NO
2011	71.87	1.87	4.23	5.07	NO, IE	NO	0.11	NO
2012	75.16	3.11	4.43	4.25	NO, IE	NO	0.11	NO
2013	74.45	3.10	4.50	5.31	NO, IE	NO	0.11	NO
2014	68.52	2.68	4.09	4.40	NO, IE	NO	0.11	NO
2015	68.72	3.11	3.76	6.01	NO, IE	NO	0.11	NO
Per cent change 1990–2015	**–27.9**	**46.1**	**128.4**	**37 964.1**	**NA**	**NA**	**–51.5**	**NA**

Abbreviations: IE: included elsewhere, NA = not applicable, NO = not occurring.

[a] Emissions/removals reported in the sector other (sector 6) are not included in total greenhouse gas emissions.

[b] Monaco did not report indirect carbon dioxide emissions in common reporting format table 6.

Table 7
Greenhouse gas emissions by sector for Monaco, 1990–2015[a, b]
(kt CO_2 eq)

Year	*Energy*	*IPPU*	*Agriculture*	*LULUCF*	*Waste*	*Other*
1990	98.50	0.27	NA, NO	0.00	0 55	NO
1995	102.14	0.30	NA, NO	–0.02	1.10	NO
2000	102.03	3.76	NA, NO	–0.04	2.0	NO
2010	78.20	6.15	NA, NO	–0.05	2.38	NO
2011	74.56	6.89	NA, NO	–0.04	1.70	NO
2012	78.05	6.08	NA, NO	–0.04	2.94	NO
2013	77.51	7.01	NA, NO	–0.03	2.95	NO
2014	71.46	5.80	NA, NO	–0.03	2.55	NO
2015	71.61	7.09	NA, NO	0.07	3.01	NO
Per cent change 1990–2015	**–27.3**	**2 550.6**	**NA**	**4 217.1**	**450.5**	**NA**

Abbreviations: IPPU = industrial processes and product use, LULUCF = land use, land-use change and forestry, NA = not applicable, NO = not occurring.

[a] Emissions/removals reported in the sector other (sector 6) are not included in total greenhouse gas emissions.

[b] Monaco did not report indirect carbon dioxide emissions in common reporting format table 6.

Annex II

Documents and information used during the review

A. Reference documents

"Guidelines for national systems for the estimation of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks under Article 5, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol". Annex to decision 19/CMP.1. Available at <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2005/cmp1/eng/08a03.pdf#page=14>.

"Guidelines for the preparation of the information required under Article 7 of the Kyoto Protocol". Annex to decision 15/CMP.1. Available at <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2005/cmp1/eng/08a02.pdf>.

"Guidelines for review under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol". Annex to decision 22/CMP.1. Available at <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2005/cmp1/eng/08a03.pdf#page=51>.

"Guidelines for the preparation of national communications by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention, Part I: UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual greenhouse gas inventories". Annex I to decision 24/CP.19. Available at <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/cop19/eng/10a03.pdf#page=4>.

"Guidelines for the technical review of information reported under the Convention related to greenhouse gas inventories, biennial reports and national communications by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention". Annex to decision 13/CP.20. Available at <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2014/cop20/eng/10a03.pdf#page=6>.

"Implications of the implementation of decisions 2/CMP.7 to 4/CMP.7 and 1/CMP.8 on the previous decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Protocol, including those relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol, Part I: Implications related to accounting and reporting and other related issues". Decision 3/CMP.11. Available at <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2015/cmp11/eng/08a01.pdf#page=5>.

"Implications of the implementation of decisions 2/CMP.7 to 4/CMP.7 and 1/CMP.8 on the previous decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Protocol, including those relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol, Part II: Implications related to review and adjustments and other related issues". Decision 4/CMP.11. Available at <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2015/cmp11/eng/08a01.pdf#page=30>.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2006. 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. Available at <http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/index.html>.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2014. 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol. Available at <http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/kpsg>.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2014. 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands. Available at <http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/wetlands/index.html>.

B. Additional information provided by the Party

Responses to questions during the review were received from Mr. Jérémie Carles (Department of the Environment), including additional material on the methodology and assumptions used.

Annex III

Acronyms and abbreviations

CH_4	methane
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
CO_2	carbon dioxide
CO_2 eq	carbon dioxide equivalent
CPR	commitment period reserve
ERT	expert review team
FMRL	forest management reference level
GHG	greenhouse gas
HFC	hydrofluorocarbon
IE	included elsewhere
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPPU	industrial processes and product use
LULUCF	land use, land-use change and forestry
NA	not applicable
NF_3	nitrogen trifluoride
NO	not occurring
N_2O	nitrous oxide
PFC	perfluorocarbon
QELRC	quantified emission limitation and reduction commitment
SF_6	sulphur hexafluoride
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change